SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, released iodine-129 is the predominant contributor. The analysis indicates that the concentrations of technetium-99 and iodine-129 at the IDF-East barrier are the only COPCs to exceed the benchmark concentration.

The release of total uranium appears fairly homogeneous between the release source and the Columbia River nearshore. Although the concentration in this plume is well below the benchmark, total uranium remains in the environment, and trends show an increasing concentration through the end of this analysis period (CY 11,885).

5.3.1.2.2.3 Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case

ACTIONS AND TIMEFRAMES INFLUENCING GROUNDWATER IMPACTS

Capacities under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, were designed to accommodate waste generation volumes associated with Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, and FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 or 3, as well as onsite and offsite waste. Summaries of the actions and timelines for Waste Management Alternative 2 are provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.

For the long-term groundwater impacts analysis, two major periods have been identified for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case:

- The disposal period was assumed to start with the onset of disposal operations in IDF-East and the RPPDF in CY 2009 and continue through CY 2100. During this disposal period, the materials in these permitted, operational facilities would not be available for release to the environment.

- The post-disposal period was assumed to start in CY 2101 and continue through the 10,000-year period of analysis until CY 11,940. At the start of this period, materials in IDF-East and the RPPDF would become available for release to the environment. For the purpose of analyzing long-term groundwater impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, IDF-East and the RPPDF were assumed to be covered by a barrier limiting infiltration for the first 500 years of the post-disposal period.

COPC DRIVERS

A total of 40 COPCs were analyzed for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case. Full results are tabulated in Appendices M, N, and O, but this discussion of long-term impacts associated with Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, is focused on the following COPC drivers:

- Radiological risk drivers: iodine-129 and technetium-99
- Chemical risk drivers: none
- Chemical hazard drivers: chromium, fluoride, and nitrate

The COPC drivers for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, were selected by evaluating the risk or hazard associated with all 40 COPCs during the year of peak risk or hazard at the Core Zone Boundary during the 10,000-year period of analysis and selecting the major contributors. This process is described in Appendix Q. The radiological risk drivers listed above account for essentially 100 percent of the radiological risk. No chemical risk is predicted. The chemical hazard

drivers above account for over 99 percent of the chemical hazard associated with Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case.

The COPC drivers that are discussed in detail in this section (iodine-129, technetium-99, chromium, nitrate, and fluoride) are all mobile (i.e., they move with groundwater) and long-lived (relative to the 10,000-year period of analysis), or stable. They are essentially conservative tracers. The other COPCs that were analyzed do not significantly contribute to drinking water risk at the Core Zone Boundary during the period of analysis because of high retardation factors (i.e., retention in the vadose zone), short half-lives (i.e., rapid radioactive decay), or a combination of both factors.

ANALYSIS OF RELEASE AND MASS BALANCE

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, in terms of the total amount released to the vadose zone, groundwater, and the Columbia River. Releases of radionuclides are totaled in curies; chemicals, in kilograms. Both are totaled over the 10,000-year period of analysis. Note that the release amounts are plotted on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of releases that vary over 10 orders of magnitude within the same series of figures.

200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility

IDF-East has seven subtotals plotted, representing releases from ETF-generated secondary waste, PPF glass, retired melters, tank closure secondary waste, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, waste management secondary and onsite waste, and offsite waste.

Figure 5–623 shows the release to the vadose zone of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–624, the chemical hazard drivers. The inventories in the waste forms are a major factor in the quantities released to the vadose zone. The predominant source of technetium-99 in the vadose zone is offsite waste (72 percent), followed by tank closure secondary waste (22 percent) and ETF-generated secondary waste (4 percent). The sources of the iodine-129 release are offsite waste (46 percent) and ETF-generated secondary waste (51 percent). The chromium release is from tank closure secondary waste (87 percent), waste management secondary and onsite waste (6 percent), offsite waste (3 percent), ETF-generated secondary waste (2 percent), and PPF glass (1 percent). Approximately 100 percent of the nitrate released is from ETF-generated secondary waste. The only source of fluoride is from waste management secondary and onsite waste.



Figure 5–623. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–624. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–625 shows the release to groundwater of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–626, the chemical hazard drivers. In addition to the waste form inventory, release to groundwater is controlled by the transport properties of the COPC drivers and by the rate of moisture movement through the vadose zone. Most of the vadose zone technetium-99 (88 percent) and iodine-129 (69 percent) and all of the chromium and nitrate are released to groundwater during the period of analysis.



Figure 5–625. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–626. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–627 shows the release to the Columbia River of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–628, the chemical hazard drivers. Release to the Columbia River is controlled by the transport properties of the COPC drivers. Most of the groundwater technetium-99 (99 percent), iodine-129 (96 percent), chromium (99 percent), and nitrate (greater than 99 percent) are released to the Columbia River over the period of analysis.



Figure 5–627. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–628. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River

Overall, most of the vadose zone technetium-99 (87 percent), iodine-129 (66 percent), chromium (98 percent), and nitrate (greater than 99 percent) from IDF-East are released to the Columbia River. These releases are almost identical to those for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.

River Protection Project Disposal Facility

Figure 5–629 shows the release to the vadose zone of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–630, the chemical hazard drivers. Release to the vadose zone is controlled by the inventory (i.e., 100 percent of the inventory is released during the post-disposal period). The predominant releases from the RPPDF are technetium-99 and iodine-129, with technetium-99 being the predominant radionuclide released. The chemical releases from the RPPDF include nitrate (largest source) and chromium (smallest source). Fluoride is not released from the RPPDF.



Figure 5–629. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–630. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–631 shows the release to groundwater of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–632, the chemical hazard drivers. In addition to the inventory, release to groundwater is controlled by the transport properties of the COPC drivers and by the rate of moisture movement through the vadose zone. All of the RPPDF vadose zone technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate are released to groundwater.



Figure 5–631. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–632. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–633 shows the release to the Columbia River of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–634, the chemical hazard drivers. Release to the Columbia River is controlled by the transport properties of the COPC drivers. All of the RPPDF groundwater iodine-129, technetium-99, chromium, and nitrate are released to the Columbia River.



Figure 5–633. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–634. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River

Overall, greater than 99 percent of the RPPDF vadose zone radionuclides and chemicals are released to the Columbia River during the period of analysis. This release is almost identical to that identified for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.

ANALYSIS OF CONCENTRATION VERSUS TIME

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, in terms of groundwater concentration versus time at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River nearshore. Concentrations of radionuclides are in picocuries per liter; chemicals, in micrograms per liter. The benchmark concentration of each radionuclide and chemical is also shown. The concentrations are plotted on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of concentrations.

Table 5–103 lists the maximum concentrations of the COPCs in the peak year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore. Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, peak concentrations of technetium-99 and iodine-129 exceed their benchmarks at IDF-East in CY 7672 and CY 7847, respectively. Iodine-129 also approaches its benchmark concentration at the Core Zone Boundary and at the Columbia River nearshore at about CY 8000. No other constituents exceed their benchmark concentrations under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case.

Table 5–103. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore

Contaminant	IDF-East	RPPDF	Core Zone Boundary	Columbia River Nearshore	Benchmark Concentration
Radionuclide (picocuries per liter)					
Technetium-99	**2,300** (7672)	220 (3812)	557 (7328)	379 (7754)	900
Iodine-129	**4.0** (7847)	0.4 (3858)	0.9 (8060)	0.6 (7973)	1
Chemical (micrograms per liter)					
Chromium	2 (8501)	34 (3807)	29 (3901)	19 (4558)	100
Nitrate	14,600 (7954)	9,860 (3733)	7,220 (3814)	4,340 (4606)	45,000

Note: Corresponding calendar years shown in parentheses. Concentrations that would exceed the benchmark value are indicated in **bold** text.

Key: COPC=constituent of potential concern; IDF-East=200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility; RPPDF=River Protection Project Disposal Facility.

Figures 5–635 through 5–638 show concentration versus time for technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, and chromium, respectively. Except nitrate, the concentration-versus-time plots are essentially identical to those for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.

The release of technetium-99 (see Figure 5–635) at the RPPDF causes a small rise in concentration at the RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore, peaking around CY 3940 but remaining about an order of magnitude below the benchmark. Concentrations at the RPPDF barrier drop off around CY 6000. Beginning around CY 4500, concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Columbia River nearshore, and IDF-East barrier begin climbing again from releases at IDF-East. This second peak causes technetium-99 concentrations to exceed the benchmark at the IDF-East barrier by less than an order of magnitude from about CY 6500 to CY 9500. Concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore do not exceed the benchmark concentrations.



Figure 5–635. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time

Iodine-129 concentrations show a pattern similar to that of technetium-99. Figure 5–636 shows iodine-129 exceeding benchmark concentrations starting at about CY 6200 and continuing through CY 10,400 at the IDF-East barrier. Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River nearshore do not exceed the benchmark concentrations.

Nitrate concentrations peak near the start of the analysis period around CY 3800 at the RPPDF barrier and Core Zone Boundary as a result of releases from the RPPDF (see Figure 5–637). A second peak occurs around CY 7940 at the IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore as a result of releases from IDF-East. Nitrate concentrations never exceed benchmark concentrations.

Figure 5–638 shows that the chromium concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore always remain below the benchmark concentration. Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, chromium is below the benchmark by at least one order of magnitude.

Figure 5–639 shows concentration versus time for total uranium. Uranium-238 has no detectable release to the environment. Total uranium concentrations, while very low, continue to increase during the period of analysis and beyond. The total uranium concentrations remain at least six orders of magnitude below the benchmark concentration throughout the analysis period (through CY 11,940). These release concentrations are basically identical to those for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.



Figure 5–636. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time



Figure 5–637. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time



Figure 5–638. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time



Figure 5–639. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time

ANALYSIS OF SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF CONCENTRATION

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, in terms of the spatial distribution of COPC driver concentrations in groundwater at selected times. Concentrations of radionuclides are in picocuries per liter; chemicals, in micrograms per liter. Concentrations of each radionuclide and chemical are indicated by a color scale that is relative to the benchmark concentration. Concentrations greater than the benchmark concentration are indicated by the fully saturated colors green, yellow, orange, and red in order of increasing concentration. Concentrations less than the benchmark concentration are indicated by the faded colors green, blue, indigo, and violet in order of decreasing concentration. Note that the concentration ranges are on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of concentrations.

Figures 5–640 through 5–651 show concentration distributions in CYs 3890, 7140, and 11,885 of technetium-99, iodine-129, nitrate, and chromium. Figure 5–652 shows the concentration distribution of total uranium in CY 11,885. These data show that groundwater releases extend from IDF-East east to the Columbia River and from the RPPDF north to the Columbia River. The IDF-East release is contained in a narrow area until it reaches one-third the distance to the Columbia River, where it begins to spread out. The RPPDF release remains in a fairly narrow channel until about halfway to the Columbia River, where it spreads out.

Figure 5–640 (CY 3890) shows a technetium-99 release from the RPPDF that exceeds the benchmark concentration north of Gable Gap. Peak concentrations in this plume are 5 to 10 times the benchmark concentration. Figure 5–641 (CY 7140) shows a nearly dissipated RPPDF technetium-99 distribution, as well as a plume in which the technetium-99 released from IDF-East exceeds the technetium-99 benchmark concentration by 5 to 10 times. By CY 11,885 (see Figure 5–642), the technetium-99 from the RPPDF is nearly dissipated and the IDF-East technetium-99 release continues through CY 11,882, but most of the concentrations remain below the benchmark.

Figures 5–643 through 5–645 show similar concentration distributions of iodine-129 from the RPPDF and IDF-East; the RPPDF plume extends to the north from the Core Zone and the IDF-East plume extends to the east. Figure 5–643 shows an RPPDF plume in CY 3890, but no IDF-East plume; it only becomes visible later. Peak concentrations in the RPPDF plume are 10 to 50 times the benchmark concentration. Figure 5–644 shows the dissipation of the RPPDF iodine-129 plume and a significant IDF-East plume. An area of IDF-East iodine-129 in which concentrations exceed the benchmark has developed to the east of the Core Zone Boundary where peak concentrations are 5 to 10 times the benchmark. Figure 5–645 (CY 11,885) shows a nearly dissipated RPPDF iodine-129 plume and an IDF-East iodine-129 plume at or just over the benchmark concentration. The spatial distributions of technetium-99 and iodine-129 over the analysis period are nearly identical to those of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.

Figures 5–646 through 5–648 show plume maps (time, space, and concentration) for nitrate releases from the RPPDF and IDF-East that are similar to those for technetium-99 and iodine-129 releases. In isolated areas north of the Core Zone Boundary, the RPPDF-released nitrate concentrations exceed the benchmark concentrations by as much as 5 to 10 times the benchmark concentration; nitrate releases under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, do not exceed the benchmark.

The chromium release shown in Figures 5–649 through 5–651 is nearly identical to the nitrate release in time and spatial ranges. The RPPDF release distribution includes several areas in which the chromium concentration exceeds the benchmark in CY 3890. The IDF-East chromium release never reaches the benchmark, but the distribution continues through CY 11,885. Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, the chromium high-concentration areas dissipate more rapidly and are below the benchmark concentration by CY 11,885.

Figure 5–652 shows the concentration distribution in CY 11,885 of total uranium released from the RPPDF. The released total uranium produces a fairly homogeneous distribution between the release source and the Columbia River nearshore. The distribution concentration is consistently below the benchmark concentration. The retardation of total uranium yields a fairly consistent distribution between the point of release and the Columbia River. This indicates that the total uranium distribution will remain past CY 11,885. Identical results are observed under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–640. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–641. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–642. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–643. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–644. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–645. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–646. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–647. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–648. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–649. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–650. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–651. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–652. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, in general, the analysis indicates that the concentrations of the COPCs at the RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore remain below the benchmark concentrations. Technetium-99 and iodine-129 are the only constituents that exceed benchmark concentrations at the IDF-East barrier.

A fairly homogeneous plume of released uranium lies between the release source and the Columbia River nearshore. Although the concentrations of total uranium at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore are about six orders of magnitude lower than the benchmark concentrations during the period of analysis, the trend appears to show a continuing increase through the end of the period.

Except for isolated areas with nitrate and chromium, the spatial and time distributions are nearly identical to those under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case.

5.3.1.2.3 Disposal Group 3

Disposal Group 3 is characterized by an operational completion date of CY 2165 for both IDF-East and the RPPDF. Under Disposal Group 3, IDF-East would have a large capacity (425,000 cubic meters [556,000 cubic yards]) and the RPPDF, an even larger capacity (8,370,000 cubic meters [10,900,000 cubic yards]). These capacities were designed to meet the waste generation volumes associated with Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base or Option Case, and FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 or 3, as well as onsite and offsite waste.

ACTIONS AND TIMEFRAMES INFLUENCING GROUNDWATER IMPACTS

Under both the Base and Option Cases of Tank Closure Alternative 6A, waste would be converted to IHLW and PPF glass. IHLW would be stored on site, while PPF glass would be disposed of in IDF-East.

For the long-term groundwater impacts analysis, two major periods have been identified for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3:

- The disposal period was assumed to start with the onset of disposal operations in IDF-East and the RPPDF in CY 2009 and continue through CY 2165, when these facilities would be operationally closed. During the disposal period, the materials in these permitted, operational facilities would not be available for release to the environment.

- The post-disposal period was assumed to start in CY 2166 and continue through the 10,000-year period of analysis until CY 11,940. At the start of this period, materials in the facilities would become available for release to the environment. For the purpose of analyzing long-term groundwater impacts of Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, IDF-East and the RPPDF were assumed to be covered by a barrier limiting infiltration during the first 500 years of the post-disposal period.

COPC DRIVERS

A total of 40 COPCs were analyzed for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3. Full results are tabulated in Appendices M, N, and O, but this discussion of long-term impacts associated with Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, is focused on the following COPC drivers:

- Radiological risk drivers: technetium-99 and iodine-129
- Chemical risk drivers: none
- Chemical hazard drivers: chromium, nitrate, total uranium, and fluoride

The COPC drivers for Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, were selected by evaluating the risk or hazard associated with all 40 COPCs during the year of peak risk or hazard at the Core Zone Boundary during the 10,000-year period of analysis and selecting the major contributors. This process is described in Appendix Q. The radiological risk drivers listed above account for essentially 100 percent of the radiological risk. No chemical risk is predicted. The chemical hazard drivers above account for over 99 percent of the chemical hazard associated with Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3.

The COPC drivers that are discussed in detail in this section (iodine-129, technetium-99, chromium, fluoride, and nitrate) are all mobile (i.e., they move with groundwater) and long-lived (relative to the 10,000-year period of analysis), or stable. They are essentially conservative tracers. Total uranium was added to the list because it begins to appear toward the end of the period of analysis. Total uranium is long-lived, or stable, but is not as mobile as the other COPC drivers; it moves about seven times more slowly than groundwater. The other COPCs that were analyzed do not significantly contribute to drinking water risk at the Core Zone Boundary during the period of analysis because of high retardation factors (i.e., retention in the vadose zone), short half-lives (i.e., rapid radioactive decay), or a combination of both factors.

ANALYSIS OF RELEASE AND MASS BALANCE

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base and Option Cases, in terms of the total amount released to the vadose zone, groundwater, and the Columbia River. Releases of radionuclides are totaled in curies; chemicals, in kilograms. Both are totaled over the 10,000-year period of analysis. Note that the release amounts are plotted on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of releases that vary over eight orders of magnitude within the same series of figures.

200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility

Seven subtotals are plotted for IDF-East, representing releases from ETF-generated secondary waste, tank closure secondary waste, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, offsite waste, PPF glass, retired melters, and waste management secondary and onsite waste. Figure 5–653 shows the release to the vadose zone from IDF-East under the Base Case for the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–654, the chemical hazard drivers. Significant amounts of technetium-99 are released to the vadose zone from each of the subtotaled sources, with offsite waste and tank closure secondary waste contributing the most. Significant amounts of iodine-129 are released from three of the subtotaled sources, with offsite waste and ETF-generated secondary waste contributing the most. Chromium has four significant sources, with tank closure secondary waste and waste management secondary and onsite waste providing the most releases. Significant amounts of nitrate are released from ETF-generated secondary waste and waste management secondary and onsite waste. The only source of fluoride is waste management secondary and onsite waste.



Figure 5–653. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–654. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–655 shows the release to the vadose zone from IDF- East under the Option Case for the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–656, the chemical hazard drivers. The radiological risk drivers and the chemical hazard drivers released to the vadose zone under the Option Case are essentially identical to those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–655. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–656. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–657 shows the release to groundwater from IDF-East under the Base Case for the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–658, the chemical hazard drivers. Release to groundwater is controlled by the transport properties of the COPC drivers and by the rate of moisture movement through the vadose zone. For the conservative tracers (technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate), the amount released to groundwater is typically equal to the amount released to the vadose zone. Ninety to 100 percent of the technetium-99 released to the vadose zone from ETF-generated secondary waste and offsite waste reaches groundwater. Forty to 60 percent of the technetium-99 released to the vadose zone from other sources—i.e., PPF glass, retired melters, tank closure secondary waste, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, and waste management secondary and onsite waste—reaches groundwater. For iodine-129 from offsite waste, releases to groundwater and to the vadose zone are essentially equal. Only about 38 to 45 percent of the iodine-129 released to the vadose zone—i.e., releases from ETF-generated secondary waste, PPF glass, retired melters, tank closure secondary waste, and waste management secondary and onsite waste—reaches groundwater. Chromium released to groundwater from ETF-generated secondary waste, tank closure secondary waste, waste management secondary and onsite waste, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, and offsite waste is essentially equal to that released to the vadose zone. About 43 and 4 percent of the chromium released from PPF glass and retired melters, respectively, to the vadose zone are transferred to groundwater. Finally, the amounts of nitrate and fluoride released to groundwater from ETF-generated secondary waste and waste management secondary and onsite waste are essentially equal to the amounts released to the vadose zone.



Figure 5–657. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–658. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–659 shows the release to groundwater from IDF-East under the Option Case for the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–660, the chemical hazard drivers. The releases of radiological risk drivers and chemical hazard drivers to groundwater under the Option Case are essentially identical to those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–659. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–660. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–661 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from IDF-East to the Columbia River under the Base Case and Figure 5–662, the chemical hazard drivers. For the conservative tracers (technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate), the amount released to the Columbia River is essentially equal to the amount released to the vadose zone. Ninety to 97 percent of the technetium-99 released to groundwater from ETF-generated secondary waste, tank closure secondary waste, PPF glass, retired melters, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, waste management secondary and onsite waste, and offsite waste reaches the Columbia River. Ninety to 97 percent of the iodine-129 released to groundwater from ETF-generated secondary waste and offsite waste reaches the Columbia River. Only about 10 percent of the iodine-129 released from the tank closure secondary waste to groundwater is transferred to the river. Essentially none of the iodine-129 released to groundwater from PPF glass, retired melters, and waste management secondary and onsite waste is transferred to the river. As for chromium, 90 to 98 percent of the amount released from ETF-generated secondary waste, PPF glass, retired melters, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 waste, tank closure secondary waste, waste management secondary and onsite waste, and offsite waste reaches the Columbia River. The amount of nitrate released to the Columbia River from ETF-generated secondary waste and waste management secondary and onsite waste is essentially equal to that released to groundwater.



Figure 5–661. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–662. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River

Figure 5–663 shows the release to the Columbia River from IDF-East under the Option Case of the radiological risk drivers and Figure 5–664, the chemical hazard drivers. For IDF-East, the radiological risk drivers and the chemical hazard drivers released to the Columbia River under the Option Case are essentially identical to those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–663. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–664. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River

River Protection Project Disposal Facility

Figure 5–665 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to the vadose zone under the Base Case and Figure 5–666, the chemical hazard drivers. The only constituents released in significant amounts to the vadose zone from the RPPDF are technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate.



Figure 5–665. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–666. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–667 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to the vadose zone under the Option Case and Figure 5–668, the chemical hazard drivers. For the RPPDF, the radiological risk drivers and the chemical hazard drivers under the Option Case have essentially identical releases to the vadose zone as those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–667. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone



Figure 5–668. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone

Figure 5–669 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to groundwater under the Base Case and Figure 5–670, the chemical hazard drivers. For the RPPDF, the amount released to groundwater is essentially equal to that released to the vadose zone for technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate.



Figure 5–669. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–670. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–671 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to groundwater under the Option Case and Figure 5–672, the chemical hazard drivers. For the RPPDF, the radiological risk drivers and the chemical hazard drivers under the Option Case have essentially identical releases to groundwater as those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–671. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater



Figure 5–672. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater

Figure 5–673 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to the Columbia River under the Base Case and Figure 5–674, the chemical hazard drivers. For the RPPDF, about 99 percent of the amount of technetium-99, iodine-129, chromium, and nitrate released from groundwater reaches the Columbia River.



Figure 5–673. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–674. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River

Figure 5–675 shows the release of the radiological risk drivers from the RPPDF to the Columbia River under the Option Case and Figure 5–676, the chemical hazard drivers. For the RPPDF, the radiological risk drivers and the chemical hazard drivers under the Option Case have essentially identical releases to the Columbia River as those under the Base Case.



Figure 5–675. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River



Figure 5–676. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River

ANALYSIS OF CONCENTRATION VERSUS TIME

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base and Option Cases, in terms of groundwater concentration versus time at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River nearshore. Concentrations of radionuclides are in picocuries per liter; chemicals, in micrograms per liter. The benchmark concentration of each radionuclide and chemical is also shown.

Note that the concentrations are plotted on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of concentrations that vary over five orders of magnitude.

Tables 5–104 and 5–105 list the maximum concentrations of the COPCs in the peak year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore. Under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, peak concentrations of technetium-99 and iodine-129 exceed their benchmarks at IDF-East in CY 7678 and CY 8036, respectively. Iodine-129 reaches its benchmark concentration at the Core Zone Boundary (CY 7914) and approaches the benchmark at the Columbia River nearshore (CY 7755). No other constituents exceed their benchmark concentrations under Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case. The peak CYs under the Option Case are identical to those under the Base Case.

Table 5–104. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore

Contaminant	IDF-East	RPPDF	Core Zone Boundary	Columbia River Nearshore	Benchmark Concentration
Radionuclide (picocuries per liter)					
Technetium-99	**2,440** (7678)	147 (3896)	577 (7891)	370 (8233)	900
Iodine-129	**4.2** (8036)	0.3 (4027)	1.0 (7914)	0.6 (7755)	1
Chemical (micrograms per liter)					
Chromium	2 (8326)	4 (3869)	3 (3701)	2 (4608)	100
Nitrate	9,590 (7983)	248 (3783)	3,130 (7860)	2,140 (7994)	45,000

Note: Corresponding calendar years shown in parentheses. Concentrations that would exceed the benchmark value are indicated in **bold** text.

Key: COPC=constituent of potential concern; IDF-East=200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility; RPPDF=River Protection Project Disposal Facility.

Table 5–105. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore

Contaminant	IDF-East	RPPDF	Core Zone Boundary	Columbia River Nearshore	Benchmark Concentration
Radionuclide (picocuries per liter)					
Technetium-99	**2,420** (7678)	235 (4018)	577 (7723)	373 (8233)	900
Iodine-129	**4.2** (8036)	0.4 (3919)	1.0 (7914)	0.6 (7755)	1
Chemical (micrograms per liter)					
Chromium	2 (8501)	32 (3873)	28 (3865)	21 (4487)	100
Nitrate	14,600 (7954)	9,270 (3930)	7,820 (3782)	5,190 (4701)	45,000

Note: Corresponding calendar years shown in parentheses. Concentrations that would exceed the benchmark value are indicated in **bold** text.

Key: COPC=constituent of potential concern; IDF-East=200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility; RPPDF=River Protection Project Disposal Facility.

Figure 5–677 shows the concentration-versus-time plot under the Base Case for technetium-99. Releases cause the groundwater concentrations at the RPPDF barrier and Core Zone Boundary to peak within one order of magnitude below the benchmark concentration around CY 3900. From about CY 6500 to CY 9500, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier exceed the benchmark concentration by less than an order of magnitude. During this time, concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River nearshore mirror the IDF-East concentrations, but do not exceed the benchmark concentration throughout the period of analysis.



Figure 5–677. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–678 shows the concentration-versus-time plot for technetium-99 under the Option Case. The plot for technetium-99 under the Option Case is similar that under the Base Case.

The concentration-versus-time plot for iodine-129 under the Base Case shows a pattern similar to that of technetium-99. The iodine-129 concentrations at the IDF-East barrier exceed the benchmark by less than an order of magnitude from approximately CY 6400 to CY 10,200 (see Figure 5–679).



Figure 5–678. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time



Figure 5–679. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time

The plot of iodine-129 concentration versus time under the Option Case is similar to that under the Base Case (see Figure 5–680).



Figure 5–680. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–681 shows the plot of concentration versus time for chromium under the Base Case. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore never come to within an order of magnitude below the benchmark.



Figure 5–681. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–682 shows the plot of concentration versus time for chromium under the Option Case. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore remain about one-half of an order of magnitude below the benchmark.



Figure 5–682. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–683 shows the plot of concentration versus time for nitrate under the Base Case. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, which are mirrored at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River nearshore, peak around CY 3800 about two orders of magnitude below the benchmark. Around CY 8300, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore peak at less than one order of magnitude below the benchmark.



Figure 5–683. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–684 shows the concentration-versus-time plot under the Option Case for nitrate. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, which are mirrored at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River nearshore, peak at around CY 3800 but remain over two orders of magnitude below the benchmark concentration. Around CY 8300, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore peak at less than one order of magnitude below the benchmark.



Figure 5–684. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time

Figure 5–685 shows the plot of concentration versus time for total uranium under the Base Case. It is not until around CY 8500 that concentrations begin to appear on the graph. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore all remain over six orders of magnitude below the benchmark.



Figure 5–685. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time

The plot of total uranium's concentration versus time under the Option Case is similar to that under the Base Case (see Figure 5–686).



Figure 5–686. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time

ANALYSIS OF SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF CONCENTRATION

This section presents the impacts of Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, in terms of the spatial distribution of COPC driver concentrations in groundwater at selected times. Concentrations of radionuclides are in picocuries per liter; chemicals, in micrograms per liter. Concentrations of each radionuclide and chemical are indicated by a color scale that is relative to the benchmark concentration. Concentrations greater than the benchmark concentration are indicated by the fully saturated colors green, yellow, orange, and red in order of increasing concentration. Concentrations less than the benchmark concentration are indicated by the faded colors green, blue, indigo, and violet in order of decreasing concentration. Note that the concentration ranges are on a logarithmic scale to facilitate visual comparison of concentrations that vary over three orders of magnitude.

Figure 5–687 shows the spatial distribution of technetium-99 concentrations in groundwater under the Base Case in CY 3890. Releases from the RPPDF create a plume extending north through Gable Gap toward the Columbia River. Peak concentrations in this plume exceed the benchmark by up to 5 times, although most of the plume is below the benchmark. By CY 7140, releases from IDF-East create a new plume extending east toward the Columbia River (see Figure 5–688). Peak concentrations in this plume exceed the benchmark by 5 to 10 times. By the end of the period of analysis (CY 11,885), the plume created by the RPPDF has mostly dissipated, while the IDF-East plume persists, most of it below the benchmark (see Figure 5–689). Iodine-129 shows a similar spatial distribution over time, but with slightly more-intense peak concentrations (see Figures 5–690 through 5–692). Chromium and nitrate also show a similar spatial distribution over time, but with less-intense areas of peak concentration (see Figures 5–693 through 5–695 and Figures 5–696 through 5–698).

The spatial distributions of the conservative tracers under the Option Case are essentially identical to those under the Base Case, but with more-intense areas of peak concentration (see Figures 5–699 through 5–710).

Total uranium is not as mobile as the radionuclides discussed above, moving about seven times more slowly than the pore-water velocity. As a result, travel times through the vadose zone are longer, release to the aquifer is delayed, and travel times through the aquifer to the Columbia River are longer. Figure 5–711 shows the distribution of total uranium in CY 11,885 under the Base Case. A plume that is less than one-twentieth of the benchmark has been released from the RPPDF and is extending north through Gable Gap toward the Columbia River. Because of the slow nature of uranium's pore-water velocity, most of the uranium releases are expected after the period of analysis. The spatial distribution of total uranium under the Option Case is slightly more developed than that under the Base Case (see Figure 5–712).



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–687. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–688. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–689. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–690. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–691. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–692. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–693. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–694. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–695. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–696. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–697. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–698. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–699. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–700. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–701. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–702. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–703. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–704. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–705. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–706. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–707. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–708. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–709. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–710. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–711. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885



Note: To convert meters to feet, multiply by 3.281.

Figure 5–712. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Under the Base Case, technetium-99 releases cause the groundwater concentrations at the RPPDF barrier to peak within one order of magnitude below the benchmark concentration around CY 3900 and at the Core Zone Boundary around CY 7900. From about CY 6500 to CY 9500, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier exceed the benchmark concentration by less than an order of magnitude. During this time, concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River nearshore mirror the IDF-East concentrations, but do not exceed the benchmark throughout the period of analysis.

The behavior of technetium-99 under the Option Case is similar to that under the Base Case.

The iodine-129 concentrations under the Base Case show a pattern similar to that of technetium-99. The iodine-129 concentrations at the IDF-East barrier exceed the benchmark by less than an order of magnitude from approximately CY 6400 to CY 10,200.

Iodine-129 concentrations under the Option Case show a pattern similar to that under the Base Case.

Concentrations of chromium at the Core Zone Boundary under the Base Case at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore never come to within an order of magnitude below the benchmark.

Chromium concentrations over time under the Option Case at the RPPDF barrier, IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore remain about one-half of an order of magnitude below the benchmark.

Under the Base Case, nitrate concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, which are mirrored in the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River nearshore, peak at around CY 3800 about two orders of magnitude below the benchmark. Around CY 7900, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore peak at less than one order of magnitude below the benchmark level.

Under the Option Case, nitrate concentrations at the RPPDF barrier peak at around CY 3800 but remain over an order of magnitude below the benchmark concentration. Around CY 8300, concentrations at the IDF-East barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore peak about an order of magnitude below the benchmark.

Under the Base Case, total uranium concentrations begin to register on the graph in CY 8500. The concentrations at the RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River nearshore all remain over six orders of magnitude below the benchmark level. Total uranium concentrations under the Option Case behave similarly to those under the Base Case.